

Remarks

Claims 1 through 23 remain pending in the application.

The advisory action dated June 7, 2010 indicates that applicant's arguments have been addressed in the previous office action dated February 22, 2010. Specifically, the office action asserts that the prior art of record more than fairly teaches and suggest the claimed limitations and therefore maintains the rejection.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that the February 22, 2010 office action addresses applicant's arguments. On page 3 of the February 22, 2010 office action, the Examiner asserts that the Applicant has no clear and definite definition of computational resources. In addition, on page 10 of the office action, the Examiner maintains a previous objection to the specification asserting that pages 1 to 2 are missing from the specification in the record. Applicant's definition of the term computational resources is contained on pages 1 to 2 of the specification. Thus, because the previous office actions do not acknowledge the existence of Applicant's definition of computational resources Applicant respectfully disagrees that the prior art of record more that fairly teaches and suggests the claimed limitations. The claimed limitation is defined by the use as described on pages 1 to 2 and these pages were not recognized as part of the application until at least May 24, 2010 (the date of Applicant's last response). Therefore, Applicant requests a new advisory action on the merits in light of the fact that the term computational resources is defined in the specification and not previously addressed.

Conclusion

This response has addressed all of the Examiner's grounds for objection. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims is requested.

Date: July 8, 2010

By: /Niky Economy Syrengelas/
Niky Economy Syrengelas, Esq.
Reg. No. 46680